

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-38, and 40-53 are pending in this application. The Final Office Action mailed January 10, 2005 rejected each of the pending claims. In addition, the Office Action objected to claim 1. Claims 1, 5, 48, 50, and 51 have been amended in this response. No claims have been added or deleted. No new matter has been added. For the reasons discussed in detail below, Applicants submits that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to claim 1 because the word "Method" at line 1 should be changed to "method." Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this observation, and, in response has amended claim 1, to correct this informality.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejected claims 5-16, 19-30, 37, 48, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,021,412 issued to Ho et al. (hereafter "Ho") and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,674 to Murakami et al. (hereafter "Murakami"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action argues that Ho teaches an embodiment in which a query is created by examining each word in the document as it is inputted by the user. After the user inputted **each** word, the facility of Ho compares the inputted word to the concept matching words and allows the user to add an instance of graphics. The Office Action therefore, argues, that Ho teaches an embodiment in which the query is created by selecting the nearest word to the cursor, as originally claimed.

However, as amended, the Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach all of the claimed limitations. For example, as amended, claim 1 recites a method for searching a database to obtain an object that is related to an indicated object in a document. The

method of claim 1 further recites, among other things, automatically creating a query..., wherein the query is created by enabling a sentence comprising a plurality of words to be input into the document, repositioning a cursor nearest to any one of the words in the sentence, wherein the cursor is capable of being repositioned nearest to any one of the words after the sentence is entered into the document, and after repositioning the cursor, selecting the nearest word to the cursor in the sentence as the indicated object without having a user make a selection for the query in a separate document.

Thus, the claimed invention enables the user to enter a sentence (string) into the document, reposition the cursor to determine the nearest word to the cursor and employ that word as the indicated text. See Applicants' specification, page 8 line 16 - page 9 line 3. The present invention employs application programs such as email, spreadsheets, word processors, slide show presentations, browsers, and editors, each of which generally have repositionable cursors. See Applicants' specification, page 8 lines 7-12. Such inherent attribute of the disclosed application programs enables the claimed invention to reposition the cursor after a sentence is inputted such that the cursor is nearest to any one of the words in the sentence. This is a subtle, but important distinction, because, unlike the claimed invention, the cited art examines **each word in the document as it is inputted by the user**. See Ho, Col. 3 lines 63 - 65. Clearly, examining each word as it is inputted by the user is not the same as enabling the cursor to be repositioned nearest to any one of the words in a sentence after the sentence is inputted into the document. Therefore, the cited reference does not suggest or disclose the claimed invention. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

In addition, because amended independent Claims 5, 48, 50, and 51 include similar limitations as Claim 1, albeit different, they are also allowable for at least substantially the same reasons as independent Claim 1.

In regard to Claims 2-3; 6-38, 40-47; 49; and 52-53 which are dependent on amended independent Claims 1, 5, 48, and 51, respectively, they are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above for those independent claims.

CONCLUSION

By the foregoing explanations, Applicants believe that this response has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed in the Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: March 15, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By *J. Wiegand*
Jamie L. Wiegand

Registration No.: 52,361

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

Customer No.: 39179

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant